No. 46. VOL. VI.

The Balance, AND COLUMBIAN REPOSITORY.

"HAIL SACRED POLITY, BY FREEDOM REAR'D!
"HAIL SACRED FREEDOM, WHEN BY LAW RESTRAIN'D!"
BEATTIE.

HUDSON, (New-York) TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1807.

To Readers.

FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS.

ANXIOUS to render my services as acceptable and useful to the public as possible, I have made such arrangements as to enable me to devote the whole of my time, in future, to political and literary pursuits. For this purpose, I have formed a copartnership (to commence on the first of January next) with a young gentleman, who is well versed in the concerns of my establishment, and with whose qualifications for business I am well acquainted. Every reader, having a just idea of an editor's duty, must perceive the advantages of this arrangement. I have also concluded to spend a portion of each week, during the sitting of the legislature, at Albany, which, being the seat of government and the most commanding political ground in the state, will afford me an opportunity (exclusive of the attention which I may bestow on a paper in that city) of conveying to my readers, through the medium of the Balance, the earliest and most authentic information relating to the affairs of the state. At this interesting crisis, this must be deemed an important consideration.

Thus far, as respects myself.....and now if my delinquent customers will exert themselves to remove certain *dead weights* which preponderate so much against my interest as almost to make me *kick the beam*, THE BALANCE may still hold its ground.

H. CROSWELL.

Balance-Office, Nov. 1807.

Original.

Hither the products of your closet-labors bring,
Enrich our columns, and instruct mankind.

FOR THE BALANCE.

THOUGHTS.

HABITUAL solitude is unfavorable to improvement and happiness.

Some persons are pleased with viewing the forked lightnings, and hearing the peals of thunder, while others, apparently as good, are extremely terrified. The difference, perhaps, is in their several constitutions. The following is a sublime expression in a very sublime psalm; "The God of glory thundereth."

Only a great man is capable of judging of another great man. There are no finer lines in Addison's Campaign than these two descriptive of Marlborough and Eugene:

"Great souls, by instinct, to each other turn,
"Demand alliance, and in friendship burn."

The reason why buckskin breeches are not so common as formerly, may be that deer are more scarce.

To think the light of nature sufficient to dictate our duty, and reject revelation, is to search our way by a candle and refuse the bright shining of the sun; it is to sink into eternal perdition while a hand is kindly held out to help us.

He is the true orator who forgets himself, or what the audience will think of him, and is wholly engrossed with his subject.

Health is absolutely necessary to all earthly enjoyment. "O blessed health!" says *Sterne*, "thou art above all gold and treasure; he that has thee, has little more to wish for! and he that is so wretched as to want thee, wants every thing with thee."

We must not always judge that the temper is bad, from heavy brows, or a certain sourness of look. There is a good natured frown.

MENTOR.

Communications.

I wish somebody would construe the following part of Mr. Jefferson's late message: "The expense," says he, "of such a standing force, and its inconsistence with our principles, dispense with those courtesies which would necessarily call for it, and leave us equally free to exclude the navy, as we are the army of a foreign power, from entering our limits."—How is it inconsistent with our principles to keep a *standing force?* Do *courtesies* necessarily call for it? Is not as much force required to exclude a navy, as to constrain obedience to the laws when in our harbors? Does not Mr. Jefferson himself say, in his message, "The British commanders remained within our waters in defiance of the authority of the country, by habitual violations of its jurisdiction," &c. The reader may guess at the meaning of Mr. Jefferson, but will be puzzled to reconcile it with honesty and common sense.

X.

It is to be wished that the editors of papers would give a summary rather than a detail of the proceedings of congress. What Mr. *Sloan*, Mr. *Smilie* or Mr. *Findley*, jumping up, says, affords no edification to the public.

A HINT.

Since Mr. Jefferson, as appears from his late message, is chief justice of the United States, and determines what is "testimony," what is "law," and what "the administration of the law," the most exact decisions may be expected. Seated like Jupiter, as Allen B. M'Gruder saith, on the top of Olympus, he views all around him.

C.

The confidence of the democrats in John Randolph seems to be entirely at an end. He is no longer appointed chairman of any important committee of congress. His fate might have been easily foreseen from the moment he was discovered to unite with his talents, independence of mind.

AN OBSERVER.

Editor's Closet.

Extract of a letter from Washington, to the editor, dated November 3.

"We are going on from day to day, doing nothing. It is not therefore in my power to give you any information on the subject which has occupied public attention for the last four months. The president, in his message, has been extremely economical of that same commodity; and all those about the royal person seem equally pertinacious of maintaining the liberty of holding their tongues.—A few little sketches, however, if not instructing, may be amusing to you.——Our speaker is GENERAL JOSEPH B. VARNUM, of Massachusetts, a broad, thick junk of a man, the perfect picture of the squab fiend. Tracy, during the last session, came into the house when Varnum was in the chair—"What is that in the chair there," said Tracy. "Why it's a man," was the reply. "Aye," says T. "I see now it's a man; but which end of him is uppermost?"——"Our speaker," said Randolph the other day to a senator, "would be a very good speaker if he could either read or write."——But our clerk, who has once been a member of the house, is the most stupid body————————————Randolph has been left off the standing committees, and is highly irritated. He is preparing a philippic, it is said, of dreadful note. Democracy has very little talent in our house."

It has long been foreseen that a grand division must take place in the democratic party, concerning the general politics of the nation, previous to another presidential election, and we have looked forward to the present session of Congress as the period when the division line would be drawn.—The work commenced with the session, and will unquestionably be completed before its close. We shall carefully mark its progress.—For the present, it may be proper to mention, that gen. Varnum is made a sort of presidential stalking horse—and Mr. Randolph takes the lead of the opposite party.—The following extract from Cheetham's paper is in point:

"General Varnum, who in the absence of Mr. Macon has been elected speaker of the house of representatives, is from Massachusetts. Mr. Varnum is the person whom Mr. Randolph has some three or four times, at former sessions of Congress, sarcastically lashed as a kind of backstair and ear wig gentleman, in some executive business, which was not very agreeable to Mr. R. Now whether Mr. R. was right or wrong is very immaterial as to what I am about to say—Mr. Varnum is speaker of the house by *one* vote, and by way, it seems to me, of wreaking a little revenge, he has excluded Mr. Randolph from the committee of ways and means, of which he was for several years Chairman. 'Tis pitiful. Why should the *little* enmity of Mr Varnum deprive the country, in the committee of ways and means, of the benefit of Mr. Randolph's great talents? Mr Varnum can have no adequate apology for the exclusion, and I am sorry to say that at the opening of his new function he has deliberately placed himself in a situation from which an *enlightened* man would immediately escape."

Extract from a Letter.

"By intelligence from Washington, it appears that the clerk of the house of representatives is a bad reader, and that the speaker is still worse. This must necessarily occasion a waste of time, and protract the present session of congress. This circumstance could not have been known to those who elected them; or they did not duly reflect on the pain which a stammering and blundering reader always gives to his hearers. Mr. Jefferson sends a *message*, instead of reading himself a *speech*; and on this occasion it is happy, as the audience will not be tortured twice. I find that one editor calls the clerk *Olympus* M'Gruder. In this he is mistaken. The christian name of the man who seated Mr. Jefferson on the top of Olympus, and for which he obtained a good office, is not *Patrick*, but ALLEN B. Probably they are brothers, or at least cousins; I have no particular information.

"The remarks which are making upon Mr. Jefferson's message, will answer little or no purpose. A thousand inconsistencies, contradictions and absurdities, displayed in the clearest and most forcible manner, will have no effect, until the infatuation of the people subsides. And yet I cannot condemn the sincere and enlightened lover of his country, for holding up at all times, the weakness of rulers, and the dreadful dangers which impend.

"The most monstrous part of the message strikes me to be that respecting the trial of col. Burr. "I shall think it my duty," says Mr. Jefferson, "to lay before you the proceedings and the evidence publicly exhibited on the arraignment of the principal offenders before the circuit court of Virginia. You will be enabled to judge whether the defect was in the testimony, in the law, or in the administration of the law; and wherever it shall be found, the legislature alone can apply or originate the remedy." —Without entering into a full discussion of the above, let me simply ask a few questions. Why does Mr. Jefferson think it his duty to lay before the legislature the proceedings and the evidence in this case? do they constitute another and higher tribunal? is not the judiciary a separate and independent branch of the constitution? If it be subject to the dictates of the president or of the legislature, is not its independence destroyed and despotism established? Has not the judge alone the right of determining what testimony is admissible, and the jury of determining on the defect or sufficiency of that testimony to convict of a crime? Admitting that a man is generally thought guilty, ought he to be condemned without testimony and law? Where is the president authorised to sit on the bench of the supreme court, or even to hint at the improper administration of the law? Are not the duties belonging to him, and to the judiciary, plainly defined by our excellent constitution?

"Mr. Jefferson, if he mean any thing, means to direct an impeachment by his creatures of Judge Marshall, one of the most able and upright men in the country. He has had a difficult task to perform; in which he has shown as much patience and moderation, as accuracy and decision in his opinions. May the judiciary ever remain independent. The moment it is otherwise, despotism must ensue. I could point out to you a place in Mr. Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia," in which this sentiment is justly advanced. But alas, we are changeable beings.

"As to Mr. Jefferson's correspondence with Tom Paine it is not incredible, though very strange; and as to his saying in conversation, that in case of our going to war with Great-Britain, France would find ships and we could find men, I have never seen nor heard it contradicted."

Extract from another Letter.

"I have read the pamphlet entitled "the British Treaty." It is evidently written by a man of genius and of great political information. But it will have no effect on the democrats; they will not read it; and if they did, nature has denied many of them capacity enough to understand it. Let me rather say, that they are so wise in their own conceit, and so perverse in their disposition, that you may more easily manage a set of mules than them.

"I have not much hopes from the present session of congress. They do not combine the wisdom and decision of the country. They are likely to be taken up with schemes for the next president and vice president. Whether Mr. Jefferson will run again, or whether he will lay before congress, the sincere and earnest petitions to be a candidate for a third term, as he "thinks it his duty to lay before them the proceedings and the evidence" on the trial of col. Burr, I can only conjecture. Probably Tom Paine has received some communication on the subject, and would be able to tell."

The Judiciary,

Is the main pillar in the fabric of our liberties—one of the most essential branches of our excellent constitution. But it is in danger. We tremble for its fate. It is openly and violently assailed.—

First, by the executive—

Second, by the legislature—

Third, by the MOB.

By the executive, in his message to Congress, calling upon them to examine the testimony in the case of Burr, and to prescribe a corrective for the supposed mal-administration of the law, by the chief justice.

By the legislature, as will appear by the following resolution of the Vermont assembly:—

"Resolved, That the senators in congress from this state be instructed, and the representatives therefrom requested, to use their exertions to procure an amendment of the constitution of the United States, in such a manner as will empower the President of the United States to remove any of the judges of the supreme court of the United States upon address to him made for that purpose by a majority of the house of representatives, and two thirds of the senate in congress assembled."

By the MOB, in Baltimore. An incendiary paper published in that place, called the Whig, openly recommended the pelting of Judge Marshall. Large mobs assembled—burnt Luther Martin, Esq. in effigy, and threatened other outrages. The civil authority at length found it necessary to interfere; and accordingly issued the following notice.

"An invitation "to the young men of Baltimore" to tar and feather Luther Martin, Esq. and others, appeared in a daily paper of this city; and an infamous handbill was circulated, giving notice that the chief justice of the United States and others would be burnt in effigy. We are authorised to say (and beg the "young men" will take warning) that efficient measures have been taken to quell riot and preserve the peace of this city."

—

The following are amongst the scandalous publications which have appeared in Baltimore, on the occasion:—

[*A Handbill.*]

"AWFUL!!!

"The public are hereby notified, that four "choice spirits" are this afternoon at three o'clock to be *marshalled* for execution by the hangman on *Gallows-Hill*, in consequence of the sentence pronounced against them by the unanimous voice of every honest man in the community. The respective crimes for which they suffer, are thus stated on the record:

1. Chief Justice *M*————, for repeating his *X Y Z*-tricks; which are said to have been much aggravated by his strange capers in open court under plea of *irrelevancy*.

2. His Quid Majesty, charged with the trifling crime of wishing to divide the union and farm Barron Bastrop's grant.

3. *Blunderhasset, the chemist and fiddler*, convicted of conspiring to destroy the tone of the public fiddle.

4th. And *last*—but not "least in crime," *lawyer* Brandy Bottle—for a false, scandalous, malicious prophecy, that "before six months Aaron Burr would divide the union."

N. B. The execution of *accomplices* is postponed to a future day.

[*From the Whig.*]

In consequence of a notification contained in a handbill, which was circulated in the forenoon of yesterday, an *immense concourse* of citizens assembled at Fell's Point about 4 o'clock, where effigies of four "choice spirits" were prepared with consummate *taste*, and the person of each distinguished by an *appropriate* motto. We shall take them singly.

The first worthy was thus libelled:

"If this trial should terminate as the government wish——but this is not *relevant* to the case——I wish to hear an argument——I am willing to hear counsel on that point."

Second,

"I'll assassinate the president, and drive congress into the Potomac."

Third,

"Alas! are chemistry and bag pipes come to this?———I can't distinguish a *man* from a *horse*."

Fourth,

"My innocent persecuted friend——We take no extract, but from—molasses. My friends; the victims of governmental vengeance."

The TRAITORS thus designated: thus

"*Bedect with titles, and hung round with stringe*,"

were conveyed decently, amidst the *safe conduct* of a respectable assemblage of citizens, and burnt as usual on such occasion."

[*From the American.*]

AT A MEETING,

Of a number of democratic republicans on Thursday evening, after considerable discussion, it was

Resolved, that the democratic republican citizens of Baltimore be requested to meet at the Pantheon, this evening, at 6 o' clock, for the purpose of *taking into serious consideration the conduct of certain civil officers of this city in calling on the military to suppress an apprehended riot*; a precedent believed to be of the most dangerous nature, and deserving the most severe reprehension!!!

That the meeting may not be interrupted by men whose principles are hostile to liberty it is expected, as the room is taken by the democratic republicans, for their use only, that no others will apply for admittance; means will be taken to preserve order and harmony."

—

The day after the riot, the following letter appeared in the *Federal Gazette*:—

BALTIMORE, Nov. 4, 1807.

Mr. Hewes,

Through the channel of your paper permit me to express to the mayor and to the other civil authorities, as also to the military, particularly capt. William Barney and the First Baltimore Hussars, and capt. Samuel Hollingsworth, and the first Baltimore Troop of Horse, my approbation, for their exertions last evening to preserve the persons and property of myself and others from lawless violence. But to those worthy friends of mine, who filled my drawing room, armed with every necessary weapon to repel such violence, if attempted, no language can sufficiently express my gratitude, and while I live, they may command my every service. The endearing proof they have given me of their friendship and zeal is as *to myself*, infinitely more than a compensation for any indignity meant to be shewn to me by the deceived, deluded individuals, who planned and executed the outrage: But to those of my fellow citizens who are really anxious for the prosperity of this city, I would make a request, that they will seriously consider the consequences of such conduct; and how deeply it wounds its best interest. What person would wish to transfer his person, or his capital to a place where life, liberty and property are to be held at the will of an infuriated Mob! The cities of Philadelphia and N. York, who view with jealousy your rising greatness, will rejoice at your folly: and to the citizens of Annapolis, no act could have been more grateful—How often have they said, that if the seat of government should be removed to Baltimore, the legislature and the courts of justice would be overawed or insulted by the Mob of the City!

"To the misguided promoters of the late proceedings, I would also give one admonition. If they are in reality, what they profess to be, the friends of republican institutions, they are taking the most effectual method to bring such institutions into contempt and detestation.

I have only to add, that as no *actual* injury was done to persons or property, I rejoice that not a drop of blood has been shed. It would have rendered me unhappy indeed, had a single individual lost his life, while he confined himself to the amusement of attending my effigy to the funeral pile.

LUTHER MARTIN.

—

While the Aurora, and a few other jacobin prints, openly advocate the doings of the Baltimore mob, the American Citizen (Cheetham's paper) speaks of it in the following correct and spirited style:—

"Mobs, those many headed hydras, which in no one instance can be right, but in all must be wrong, should be discountenanced by every good man; the press should in an especial manner reprehend them. A mob is the same monster whether on this side or on that. Burr and his associate conspirators, are, indeed, detestable, and cannot be too vigilantly watched within the *limits of the law*. But are mobs—are persons tumultuously assembled in our streets, the constitutional judges of a Chief-Justice? Where is the empire of our laws? Where order, the element of all law and all good? The civil authority of Baltimore is reprehensible. It should have suppressed, I will not say by an energy *beyond the law*, but it should have suppressed this *vile rout*; it should have prevented this stain on our national character."

—

Mr. Mitchell has disposed of the *Crisis* establishment, with the view of "retiring forever from the tumultuous scenes of politics." The following is an extract from his valedictory:—

"Were I now to leave a political legacy to the people of this state, I would say to them—As far as possible, divest your passions of partizan prejudices; select for your public officers, AMERICANS, whose character for moderation, fidelity, and real patriotism, has been tried, or, at least, is known; discountenance all licentiousness of the press; oppose every species of intrigue; place barriers before immoderate ambition;—poise equally the scales of distributive justice, and above all, PRESERVE PURE YOUR JUDICIARY.—On other points I would say, promote agriculture, commerce, arts, science, and the means of common instruction; pursue the plan already adopted for placing your militia on a respectable footing, and for replenishing your armories and arsenals; encourage genius; provide generously for those who labour for the public, and liberally support the clergy. So shall you, as you ought to, become the keystone in the grand political arch of the union."

☞ The gentlemen who have heretofore attended the Hudson Dancing Assemblies, are requested to meet at Fowler's Hotel, on Wednesday evening next, at 6 o'clock. Nov. 17.

Political.

From the Evening Post.

No. II.

President's Message.—We finished our last by placing before the reader, in what we thought a pretty strong light, the violent discord between the President and his ministers, and between his ministers and themselves. We now resume the subject for another but no less interesting purpose. The message proceeds in the following manner.

"Still anxious not to close the door against friendly adjustment, new modifications were framed, and further than could before have been supposed necessary: and *our ministers were instructed to resume their negociations on these grounds.*"

What can the nation think of a chief magistrate, who, after having discovered in his ministers, an utter want of capacity and discernment, or the most scandalous duplicity towards their own government, or at any rate, and to speak in the mildest possible terms, such a discordance of views in essential points that they think that treaty to be for the best interests of the country, which he thinks so bad as to be even unworthy of consideration; what, I say, will the nation, what must the nation, what ought they to think of a chief magistrate, who, instead of recalling such ministers, instructs them to renew their negociations? Why renew them? For what possible purpose? What more could be expected of them than they had already effected? They had made and signed one treaty, which, in their conception, "embraced and settled all the points in difference between the two countries," they had as they supposed, done all that they were desired to do, and accordingly as soon as the terms were agreed upon, they wrote an *official* letter to the president on the same day, announcing to him that they had at length *concluded* a treaty on *all the points which had formed the object of their negociation*, and on favorable terms; and they concluded with saying, that they "hastened to communicate this interesting intelligence, *for the information and guidance of their government.*" When the treaty itself, however arrived, the government, to their utter amazement, instantly perceived that it contained the settlement of no one important point "for which the negotiation had been formed." It was not even worthy of being laid before the senate. It had moreover, a note tacked to it, by the other party, as a sort of protestation against being bound to ratify it after its return. And now we learn from the President that our ministers had on their part also, cautioned the British commissioners against expecting this treaty would be ratified by him inasmuch as *they had already acted contrary to their instructions.** A more curious treaty, the world never we believe, heard of.

* This, by the way, is a very different account of the treaty from what it was represented to be in the house of commons. Lord Howick, speaking of it, said, "In this however, as in all treaties, the most obvious inference would be that since it was signed by persons duly authorised, it would, in due time be ratified."

Of two things, one; and it is impossible to escape. Either our ministers did "*conclude*" what they thought a good treaty, and in conformity with their instructions, and then they and the government differ essentially as to what is a good treaty; or they did not conclude such a treaty, and then they were guilty of a most shocking violation of truth, of an attempt to deceive the government and nation; in either case, they were equally unfit to continue to represent this government, and ought to have been recalled. But instead of this, new instructions are sent out by this same government, to these same ministers, to resume their negociations.—The message goes on:

"On this new reference to amicable discussion we were *reposing* in confidence, when on the twenty-second day of June last, by a formal order from a British admiral, the frigate Chesapeake, leaving her port for a distant service, was attacked by one of those vessels which had been lying in our harbors under the indulgence of hospitality, was disabled from proceeding, had several of her crew killed, and four taken away."

Our vigilant Palinurus, forsooth, having placed our affairs in a hopeful way, by committing them to men in whom he could have no confidence, indulges himself in a comfortable nap, under the shade of Turreau's whiskers, from which he is suddenly roused by the cannon of the Leopard frigate.

It is an observation made by a writer of much celebrity, that to account for any calamities which may befal a nation, we need look no further than to mark how the principal departments of state are filled. Never was there a period that more forcibly illustrated the truth of the remark. Our chief magistrate, deficient to an extreme in capacity as a politician, and always under a strong bias towards one foreign power, and little disgraceful prejudices against another, has notoriously made it the chief object of his administration, ever since he came into power, to provide for the continuance of his own personal popularity, at whatever hazard to his country. On the accomplishment of this grand project, his mind has been constantly bent. In pursuit of it, he has sought neither for integrity nor talents, as qualifications for office, but for such alone as would render ministers subservient to his views, and obsequious to his commands.—He has hunted through the community for men actuated by motives equally honorable with his own, and in general, it must be admitted, he has been singularly happy in his selections. That he should have sent Munro to Great-Britain, might not surprise those who have been accustomed to observe his conduct, but it was perhaps going one step beyond himself, and it is, we believe, a stroke in diplomacy altogether unexampled, that he should persist in continuing this man in office, as one best calculated to promote his views in relation to a particular object, after distinctly perceiving that there existed nothing but the most diametrically opposite notions between them, as to this very object.

Miserable country! whose public affairs are made the sport of such men! Deluded people! whom nothing short of actual misery and distress can bring back to your senses, and inspire you with virtue and discernment enough to hurl these quacks and impostors from the high places to which you have been enticed to exalt them.

No. III.

The statement of the attack upon the Chesapeake, is very concise indeed, but it contains enough to characterize the transaction, and perhaps, it is all that could with propriety, be submitted at this time. We are informed that

"By a formal order from a British Admiral, the frigate Chesapeake, leaving her port for a distant service, was attacked by one of these vessels which had been lying in our harbors under the indulgences of hospitality, was disabled from proceeding, had several of her crew killed, and four taken away."

These facts being unquestionable, it forms, as we conceive, a case of attack on national sovereignty, such as no government can tamely submit to, without an ignominious surrender of its independence. As on this point however, we have the misfortune to differ from some, whose political sentiments we respect, and whom personally we highly esteem, we shall endeavor once for all, and in lieu of any other notice of the subject, to be very explicit: but our limits will compel us to be very brief.

Among those who differ from us, are some who seek to palliate, and some who go the length of justifying, the British admiral, on the ground that our government were guilty of the first wrong. We might safely admit the premises and still deny the inference. But let us bestow a few moments on the facts.

They say that we were guilty of the first wrong, by encouraging and harboring British deserters, and that the British had a right therefore, to take them by force after demand and refusal. We answer that if they will trace the transaction back in this manner, they ought to go further; and then it would appear that the wrong did not originate with us.—Three of the deserters from the British, had *first* deserted from an American vessel, and were refused to be delivered up when demanded, and if the same rule ought to operate in the same manner for and against both nations, then we say, they could have no right to insist upon its observance by us, after they themselves, had refused to observe it. But to this they answer, the desertion on our side was only from a private vessel, and on theirs from a public vessel, and that there is a material difference between a private and a public vessel. To which we reply that as to the matter in issue, there is none. We are enquiring who did the first wrong.

President Washington, in his proclamation of Neutrality in 1793 exhorted and cautioned the citizens of the United States, against aiding or abetting hostilities against any of the powers at war.——And by statute of the United States, passed in June, 1794, in conformity with

the public law of nations, it is among other things enacted. "That if any person shall within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States enlist or enter himself, or hire or retain another person to enlist or enter himself; or *to go beyond the limits or jurisdiction of the United States, with intent to be enlisted or entered* in the service of any foreign prince or state as a soldier, or as a marine or seaman on board of any vessel of war, letter of marque or privateer, every person so offending shall be guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined, not exceeding $1000, and be imprisoned not exceeding three years."* This statute is surely sufficiently explicit. It not only forbids desertion and enlistment within our jurisdiction, (and no laws can punish what is done out of their jurisdiction) but it goes the utmost extent that a law could go; for it renders penal, even the enlisting abroad, if the *intent* was conceived at home: thus laying hold of the slightest circumstance to bring it within our jurisdiction. Will any one after this, tell me that our government looked with indifference on the conduct of its citizens, in enlisting on one side of either belligerent against the other? Such enlistment is in itself a breach of neutrality, which no just government could be supposed to countenance. If then the desertion of the American seamen, and enlisting on board a ship of one of the belligerents, was, in itself, inconsistent with neutrality, and, also made a penal offence by the laws of their own country, whenever the act could by construction be brought within our jurisdiction, it could not possibly be otherwise than wrong in the British commander to receive these men on board his vessel, and his doing so was, therefore, the first wrong. And as to the argument, on which so much stress is laid, that it can never be expected that a belligerent should consent to a doctrine that would thus render him liable to lose his crew in a neutral port, by which his means of encountering the enemy would be weakened, the answer is, neither can it be expected that he should compleat his complement out of neutral seamen, by which his means of encountering the enemy would be strengthened; and if he will adopt the latter, he cannot complain of the former.

But one man, *Ratford*, was not an American; and to him none of this reasoning will apply. True. But we say that we have the evidence of commodore Barron, first, that the government ordered him to enlist no British deserters, second, that he was ignorant that he had such a man on board, Ratford having enlisted under another name. Candour, and a regard to decorum require us to take the fact to be as stated, at least till it is solemnly disproved; and then Ratford was, as to implicating the government, as much an American as any one of the crew. Of course, his being on board could afford no colour for the hostility on the ground of our knowingly and wilfully harbouring British deserters. On the other hand, one of the seamen demanded by Lord Tonenshend and for whom the attack on the Chesapeake is declared to have been made, named William Hill, was an American by birth; a circumstance confessedly known to the British, for it is admitted that he enlisted at Antigua by the name of "William Hill of *Philadelphia*."

Thus then stands the case: Taking their own view of the subject, that we did wrong in refusing to give up deserters, when traced back, the *first* wrong is seen to have been done by the other party. They have attempted to lay down one rule for themselves, by which they avail themselves of the aid and assistance of deserters to their vessels; but they will not permit us to avail ourselves of deserters from their vessels; nay, they go further and refuse us the privilege of receiving our own deserters back again to their allegiance. They make the deck of a British man of war an enchanted place, on which, whoever once steps his foot, can never return, while the decks of all other vessels are mere wood and timber, which every sailor may leave at pleasure.

We cannot conclude without taking notice of an error of no small magnitude, into which the defenders of admiral Berkeley have fallen. The true question, they say, is whether the facts that preceded the attack on the Chesapeake amounted to such a provocation, as would, if reported to the government of Great Britain, justify *reprisals* or authorize a declation of *war*.† This is not the true question, nor is it at all the question. But it is *whether a ship of war shall search another ship of war, when the respective sovereigns are at peace?* We hold, we shall ever hold, the negative, in terms unqualified.

The president, therefore, very properly denominates the attack an OUTRAGE. And he informs us that "An armed vessel of the United States was dispatched with instructions to our ministers at London, to call on that government for the satisfaction and security required by this outrage."

This was perfectly fit and proper, and meets with our full approbation. Nor do we hesitate to say that this "satisfaction and security" will be readily and cheerfully given, if not prevented by any improper, injudicious terms in which may be the demand made. We say this with the utmost confidence on the following grounds.

In the year 1799, the Baltimore sloop of war, capt. Philips, being met at sea by an English 74, commodore Loring, the latter demanded fifty seamen, and after an examination, four or five of them were taken and kept. When the news reached London, the American minister, Mr. King, instantly addressed a note to Lord Grenville, protesting against the right of a ship of war to search another ship of war, under any possible pretext, the respective sovereigns being at peace. The answer disclaimed all pretensions to exercise such a right, and promised the most ample satisfaction; and an order was immediately issued, recalling the commodore Loring. It appeared however, on examination, that capt. Philips had voluntarily sent the men on board: of course the blame rested with him. But capt. Philips was broke by his own government, for misconduct, and an order was issued by Mr. Adams to all commanders of American ships of war, not to permit themselves to be searched under any pretext or in any circumstances.

Our government are in possession of the correspondence between Mr. King and lord Grenville, on this occasion, and if they had only published it some months ago, it would not only have saved much controversy, but have had a material effect in quieting the public mind.

(To be continued.)

* I am sorry that the author of the pamphlet entitled "*Peace without dishonour, war without bote*" should have thought himself at liberty to refer to this statute without quoting it; and still more, that in so doing, he should omit to notice the latter and most important part altogether; which completely rebuts his inference.

† Author of the pamphlet.

From the United States' Gazette.

What can the President of the United States mean by saying in his message to congress: "I shall think it *my duty* to lay "before you the proceedings and the evi- "dence publickly exhibited on the arraign- "ment of the principle offenders before "the district court of Virginia?" Now I should think it his duty not to meddle with the subject in any way, unless by the exercise of his power of pardoning. With the exception of this power, the president has as little right to intermeddle with a prosecution depending before the judicial department of our government as the king of England has. But even if he had a right to intermeddle, we should be glad to be informed how he becomes possessed of the "proceedings and evidence publicly exhibited" in a court. Has the president had the audacity to require any court of the United States to report to him their proceedings and the evidence exhibited before them; and has any court been dastardly enough to comply with such a requisition? We venture to say, no. What sources of information does he possess then, which are not common to every member of congress? And what have congress to do with the subject, after the information is laid before them? That whole paragraph of the message which relates to the state prosecutions in Virginia is one of the most indecent things that ever appeared in a state paper. Neither the president nor the congress have any more business with the proceedings and the evidence in those cases than they have with the proceedings and the evidence in the case of the man who was the other day tried before judge Washington in this city for murder on the high seas.

Perhaps a more atrocious usurpation of power was never attempted in a government of laws, than that by which Mr. Jefferson claims the right of reviewing and controlling the proceedings of the judiciary. Speaking, in his message to congress, of the late prosecutions in the district of Virginia, he says: "You will be enabled "to judge whether the defect was in the "testimony, in the law, or in the adminis- "tration of the law; and wherever it shall "be found, the legislature alone can apply "or originate the remedy."

There is much important and alarming meaning in these few words. "You will be enabled to judge whether THE DEFECT," &c. How does it appear that there was a-

ny *defect?* Why, simply thus. At the last session of congress Mr. Jefferson usurped the prerogatives of a court and jury, by positively pronouncing upon the guilt of Aaron Burr. Afterwards he was put upon his trial by due process of law, and two separate juries pronounced him NOT GUILTY. Now Mr. Jefferson, assuming the position that his sentence pronounced without trial is right, and that the sentence of the court and jury, formed upon a patient and tedious investigation is wrong, infers that there is a *defect*, and that this defect exists either in the testimony, in the law, or in the administration of the law. Let us grant for a moment that a defect has really appeared in one of these three points; still we would ask what business has either the president or congress with it? Suppose the defect be in the testimony; that is, it was insufficient to found a conviction upon. Are congress to make provision for supplying such testimony in future as will be sufficient for the conviction of any person who may be denounced and declared guilty by the executive!

As to the second subject proposed for consideration, namely a defect in the law, it is in every respect a proper subject for deliberation. If the executive has observed a defect in any of the laws, it is his duty to state the fact to the legislature, and to recommend a revision.

But nothing can be more improper and indecent than the suggestion that the assumed defect may exist in the *administration of the law*, and the intimation that congress ought to *apply the remedy*. The constitution has wisely placed between the executive and the judicial departments an insuperable barrier. In case of the highest crimes and misdemeanors in a judge, the president is not at liberty, in his official capacity, so much as to speak upon the subject. It is for the immediate representatives of the people to complain and accuse by impeachment, and for the senate to judge and pronounce sentence. The president is not known or heard of in the business. He is even divested, in this instance, of the ordinary prerogative of pardoning. What then must we think of a chief magistrate, who, because he has been disappointed of the destruction of a devoted victim of his vengeance, has dared to usurp the prerogative of the house of representatives in accusing a judge whose prerogative he had before usurped by pronouncing on the guilt of a person accused of the highest crime against the state! If such enormities can be practised with impunity it is worse than idle to talk of the security of our rights or the freedom of our government.

Congress.

Evening Post Summary.

Monday Nov. 2.

The National Intelligencer begins this day's journal of the proceedings of the house, with informing us that Mr. Thomas had modestly moved for and obtained, an excuse from serving on the committee of *Commerce and Manufactures*, in order to give place to the superior talents of Mr. *Broker Mumford*, the able representative of the first commercial city in the Union.

The letter from the Legislature of New-York, praying for defence and protection, was committed to the committee on that part of the presidents message, which relates to the aggressions of foreign armed vessels.

Tuesday Nov. 3.

The speaker presented a petition from gen. Eaton's old friend Hamet Caramelli praying that congress would give him some money, which was referred to a select committee of seven.

The speaker laid before the house a memorial from *Duncan M'Farland* of North Carolina who was tried and I believe convicted of perjury or forgery or some such venial offence, and who is likewise one of the best democrats in the world, praying that the seat of John Culpepper, his rival, may be vacated and he restored to his old place. Referred to the committee of elections.

Senate—Nov. 2. A resolution passed that the members of the senate would wear crape round the left arm for one month, as a mark of respect due to the late Hon. Uriah Tracy, and the Hon. Ab. Baldwin. Mr. Adams then moved that so much of the message as relates to the late outrages committed by the British navy, and to the forming the sailors in our seaports into a militia for our defence, be referred to committee, which was done accordingly, and thus ends this chapter.

ALBANY, *March* 27, 1807.

SIR,

Pursuant to the orders of the senate and Assembly of this state, we have the honor to inclose you their joint resolutions, relative to the protection of the port of New-York.

With sentiments of high consideration, we are, sir, your obedient humble servants,

JOHN BROOME,
President of the Senate.
A. M'CORD,
Speaker of the House of Assembly.

Nathaniel Macon, Esq. Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U. S.

State of New-York.
March 20*th*, 1807.

Resolved, As the sense of this legislature, that every consideration of policy and duty requires that all adequate measures should be adopted by the national government, for the protection of the port of New-York.

That the agricultural, as well as commercial interests of the state, are deeply interested in this most desirable object.

That in surrendering to the United States the revenue arising from imposts, this state anticipated, and has now a right to expect that a competent portion of that revenue would be appropriated for its defence, and that the congress of the United States are bound by their constitutional duties, as guardian of the common defence and general welfare, to satisfy this proper and reasonable expectation.

Resolved, That an application be made to the President of the United States, in behalf of this state to fix upon a plan of durable and permanent defence for the port of New-York, fully adequate to the importance of the object, and that he be also respectfully requested to appropriate, out of the monies placed at his disposal, until congress shall have it in their power to make further provision in the premises.

Resolved, That the legislature of this state fully approve of the conduct of our senators and representatives in Congress, in advocating and enforcing the claims of this state in this respect, and that they be requested to support and enforce such further measures as may be necessary for the permanent defence of this state, and to obtain either by anual appropriation or by general provision, a sum competent to that important object.

Resolved, That three copies of the above resolutions be signed by the president of the senate, and speaker of the assembly, and that they be requested to transmit one of the said copies to the president of the United States, one to the president of the senate, and one to the speaker of the house of representatives of the United States.

By order of the senate,
JOHN BROOME, *president.*
By order of the assembly,
A. M'CORD, *speaker.*

Hudson, *November* 17.

Be it our weekly task,
To note the passing tidings of the times.

Late and interesting.

London accounts to the 28th of September, have been received by a late arrival at New-York. They furnish official intelligence of the capitulation of Copenhagen, and some interesting articles concerning our differences with Great Britain.—By these accounts it appears—

That the Danish general, on the night of the 5th of September, proposed an armistice of twenty-four hours, for preparing an agreement on which articles of capitulation might be founded. This was declined by the British; but the firing was countermanded, and an officer sent to explain that no proposal of capitulation could be listened to unless accompanied by the surrender of the fleet.—On the 6th this stipulation was acceded to, and in the evening the capitulation was drawn up.—On the 7th the ratification was exchanged, and the British proceeded to take possession.—The following is the substance of the articles of capitulation:—

1. The British troops to be put in possession of the citadel.

2. A guard of British troops to be placed in the dock-yards.

3. The ships and vessels of war of every description, with all the naval stores belonging to his Danish majesty, to be delivered up, and the possession of the dock-yards, and all the buildings and store-houses belonging thereto.

4. The British store-ships and transports to be admitted into the harbor for the purpose of embarking their stores and troops.

5. The citadel to be delivered up to the Danish troops within six weeks from the

date of the capitulation, in the same state in which it was found; and the British troops to be embarked from the island of Zealand.

6. Hostilities to cease throughout the island of Zealand, from the date of the capitulation.

7. Property and persons not to be molested.

8. Prisoners on both sides to be unconditionally restored.

9. Sequestered English property to be restored.

The following articles from English prints, are peculiarly interesting, and have an alarming appearance:—

LONDON, September 24.

The opinion that a rupture will take place between this country and America gains ground in the city. In what temper of mind Mr. Munroe took his departure is not publicly known, but it is pretty generally understood that our government maintained a dignified tone on some of the points endeavoured to be wrested from this country by threats. On some of these Mr. Monroe is said to have remarked that they have been conceded by the treaty sent some time ago to America. The answer was—"True—and if your government had ratified that treaty, his majesty's present ministers would have considered themselves bound by the act of their predecessors: but the treaty having been returned unratified, has now no more weight than any other piece of waste paper."

The question between this country and America may be reduced to a very narrow compass. The Americans contend that they have a right to trade with the French colonies, because France has permitted them during the war. We answer that, in the very nature of things, a war in which they are not a party, cannot confer privileges on them from which they are debarred in time of peace. France does not allow America to trade with her colonies during war, because it is of service to France. By the spirit of colonial law, none can trade with the colonies of any country—and it follows that every vessel so trading can have no other protection in that trade than what the mother country can afford them—they become while in that trade, the vessels of the mother country.—*Star.*

September 28.

"We are informed, and we believe our information is correct, that our government is resolved to retaliate on France by a proclamation, exactly on the model of the late French decree of blockade. Not only the coasts of France and Italy, but of every European state under the influence and control of Napoleon—as also, all foreign dependencies so circumstanced, will be declared in a state of blockade, and all vessels going to, or coming from any of them, will be declared legal prizes.

"This will at once settle the clamors of the Americans respecting their right to trade with the French colonies—carrying, or pretending to carry their produce to an American port, and afterwards to re-ship the same for Bordeaux and other French ports.

"We understand, that the definitive answer given by the ministers to Mr. Munroe, (who has not yet taken his departure) was exactly conformable to the principles that are about to be adopted. Mr. Munroe, it seems, was instructed to declare that should the British government refuse to concede the points demanded by America, the non-importation act would be immediately enforced. The reply was, "I am commanded by his majesty to inform you, that the issue of such an order by the American government, will be considered and held as a declaration of war."

"On the points respecting the right of search, Mr. Munroe was informed, that this country will maintain its right, not only respecting goods, but seamen—not even excepting American ships of war."

The subjoined observations, are from the E. Post, of the 11th inst.

Highly interesting.—By the arrival of the ship Sansom last evening, in 36 days from Plymouth, (Eng.) intelligence the most interesting, and, taking without allowance, the most alarming, has been received. It will be seen by the extracts from the English papers, that a disposition prevails at this time in the British ministry, the most hostile to this country. In addition to the information in the papers, a captain Doane, of Boston, who came passenger in the Sansom, informs, verbally, that he saw and conversed with Mr. Monroe the day before his departure, that Mr. Monroe told him, that his return was not to be considered as evidence that negotiation was entirely broken off, yet Mr. D. concluded from what was said, that "*all hopes of an amicable accommodation were now at end.*" It will, however, occur to the reader, that this is but *inference* and is inconsistent with what had just before been said; for if all hopes of amicable adjustment were at end, why continue negociation for the purpose of obtaining an amicable adjustment? The result of the impression made by a perusal of the English prints, particularly of the *leaded* articles, which generally proceed from some able pen, is, that the English are extremely exasperated at our *Non-Importation Act*, and that the first advance towards an accommodation must be taken by our government in receding from that rash and impolitic step. After that, the way, we should hope, would be again opened to tranquility and friendship.

It is stated that Mr. Monroe was instructed to *threaten* the British government, that if she did not comply, we should proceed at once to enforce the Non-Importation Act. We cannot possibly believe that is correct. As to the right of search, it is also stated that Great Britain means to insist on the right to search for her seaman, not only private neutral vessels, but national ships of war. The former part is unquestionably correct: the latter we do not believe: because she must know that it is a point that cannot be conceded; which she would never concede herself; and which she stands already committed upon, in a former correspondence in 1799, between Lord Grenville and Mr. King. This point therefore will never be made cause of war between the two countries.

We have said that the issue of peace or war will depend on the repeal of the *non-importation* act. In this, however, we may probably be too sanguine, for we are informed that she has already directed a blow at our Russian trade, and this without any previous notice, and has taken several ships engaged in that trade, particularly the ship Orion of this port, owned by the Costers, and bound direct for New-York. News has also arrived this forenoon, of the capture of the Fanny, bound from China to Amsterdam. This looks as if she had determined definitively upon proceeding to extremities without giving us the opportunity of retracting the steps we had taken. This idea is not a little strengthened by the large additional force lately sent out to Canada. But on the other hand, again, how can we account for her permitting several of our vessels with valuable cargoes to leave her ports without molestation?

Strong complaints are made in the English prints of the undue and unwarrantable leaning discovered by our administration towards France, her mortal enemy. They say that protection and accommodation were yielded to the French ships of war La Cybelle and —— in the Chesapeake, while a proclamation was issued interdicting the English ships of war from our waters, and making it penal to afford them supplies. The answer we once thought obvious and conclusive, namely, that it was the British ships that first violated our rights by demanding of our national ships to deliver up their deserters; but now it unfortunately comes out, that the French have more than once done the same thing without incurring any such consequences.

The following cases are mentioned in point:

"When the Hornet sloop of War went to L'Orient we had *five* French sailors on board, who had been naturalized, and who had been in our service for several years. A French officer came on board the Hornet and seized these men by force (then under the protection of our flag) and carried them off. Not one word has been heard about this outrage."

When the United States frigate *Constitution* H. G. Campbell, commander, lay in Cadiz Bay, the French Admiral *Rosily*, hearing that there was a French sailor on board, by the name of *Nicholas Vorhage*, sent on board and demanded him, and he was delivered up. This man was not even a deserter from any French ship, for he had never served on board of any French armed vessel, public or private, but he had voluntarily enlisted some years before on board the United States frigate Essex, while she lay at Malaga. In proof of this fact, is produced the following

CERTIFICATE.

"*Consulate of U. S. at Cadiz.*

"I do hereby certify that the bearer hereof *Nicholas Vorhage*, was serving on board of the United States ship *Constitution*, H. G. Campbell, Esq. commander, and while in this bay was delivered up in consequence of orders from the French admiral, Mons. *Rosily*.

JAMES M'CANN, *Consular Agent.*"

Supposing these facts to be correctly stated, we confess it seems to cut up the only ground the administration had left to stand upon. Let them pause then, if it is not yet too late, and reflect on the *prospect before us.*

Wreath.

FOR THE BALANCE.

LINES,

Written when recovering from a long and most distressing sickness.

HARD is the lot of human kind;
With some 'tis misery refin'd;
With others less severe.
Some from pleasure's phantom borrow
Seeds that ripen into sorrow—
Sorrows not ending here.

Ambition, with a mon'rous train,
Amidst the dying and the slain,
Looks unconcern'd around—
'Till some new object shall appear,
On which to wreak her vengeance drear,
She levels with the ground.

Av'rice, the bane of ev'ry pleasure,
Counts her gold 'till out of measure;
Nor then dares eat a meal—
Fear, with her attendant evils
Always busy, coining devils,
Close following at her heels.

Murder, in the garb of honor,
Draws the smiles of men upon her,
Nor shuns the open day.
Treason, black as hells invention,
Screen'd from ev'ry ill intention,
Perhaps in legal way.

A thousand angry passions rule,
Making of man a knave or fool,
Just as the case may be—
Some priests, and lawyers too, (we fear)
Tho' making great pretensions here,
Must hear pronounc'd "depart from me!"

All is sorrow, all is care—
Turn ye here or turn ye there—
The scene's about the same—
'Till, if perchance we may espy
A couple in sweet unity,
The wish'd for point to gain;

Striving each other to relieve,
Whene'er the one hath cause to grieve,
Or meets a heavy stroke:
It great alleviation yields,
And our own burden lighter feels,
While we behold the yoke.

Such is the lot of human kind,
Life's a bubble light as wind;
Deep sorrows strew the road,
'Till we can by celestial aid
Its blessings lose, its ills evade,
Placing our trust in God.

ANY-BODY.

October, 1807.

AGENTS,

FOR THE BALANCE.

New-York.

Tho's C. H. Croswell, PM *Catskill*—David Burt, and S. S. Freer, printer, *Kingston*—Bowman, Parsons & Foner, printers, *Poughkeepsie*—Michael Burnham, publisher of the Evening Post, *New-York*—C. Louw, PM *Shawangunk*—Daniel Ludlow, PM *Kinderhook*—Backus & Whiting, and Websters & Skinner, *Albany*—Zachariah Seymour, *Canandaigua*—Jeremiah Van Rensselaer, jun. and the PM *Utica*—R. Leavenworth, Esq *Whitestown*—Mr. Holt, PM *Cherry-Valley*—Nathan Brewster, PM *Johnstown*—E. S. Jackson and the PM *Cazenovia*—Horace H. Wadsworth, printer, *Waterford*—Samuel Crossett, PM *Aurelius*—Lionel U. Lawrence, *Stillwater*—George W. Olmsted, *Onondaga*—Chauncey Woodruff, *Herkimer*—Wright, Goodenow & Stockwell, printers, *Troy*—F. Strahahan, Esq. and B. Williams, PM *Cooperstown*—Zenas Pynneo, PM *Sharon*—E. H Gordon, PM *Geneva*—William Alexander, PM *Little-Falls*—Guy Humphrey, PM *Marcellus*—G. Tracy, printer, *Lansingburgh*—Dodd & Rumsey, printers, *Salem*—Anth. M. Hoffman, *Argyle*—D. M'Whorter, *Clinton*—E. Payne, PM *Hamilton*—Ebenezer Caulking, PM *Sullivan*—Mr. Holmes, PM *Saratoga Springs*—Joseph Shurtleff, Esq. PM *Schenectady*—Daniel Wood, PM *Pompey*—J. Sandford, PM *Ovid*—Mr. West, PM *Niagara*; Hugh Buckley, PM *Cayuga*; Cyrenus Noble, PM *Pittsfield*; Samuel Porter, *Skencateles Village*; Tracy Robinson, *Columbus*; James Savage, Esq *Plattsburgh*; Elijah Porter, *Half-Moon*; William I. Hopkins, Esq *New-Hartford*; Henry M'Neil, PM *Paris*; H. Smith, PM *Granville*; A. Van Deusen, PM *Saratoga*; T Ross, PM *Homer*; Eleazer Dana, PM *Owego Village*; Nathaniel Cole, PM *Coles'-Ville*; Cn. Stone, *Chenango-Point*; George M'Clure, PM *Bath*; William Butler, *Walton*; George Harper, PM *Occuago*; Ozias Stevens, *Unadilla*; Peter Rechtmeyre, PM *Bristol*; Jesse Williams, *Lisle*; E. Buck, PM *Chenango*; Joseph Waldo, PM *West-Ville*; Ph. Church, *Angelica*; S. Hunt, PM *Windham*; Jacob Van Ness, esq. PM *Red-Hook*.

Massachusetts.

John Hastings, PM *Boston*—Mr. Cushing, pr. *Salem*—Wm. Goodwin, Esq *Plymouth*—Elisha Ruggles, *Rochester*—E. W. Allen, pr. and the PM *Newburyport*—John Brock, jun. *Nantucket*—Ashbel Strong, Esq. *Pittsfield*—Mr. Welles, PM *Lanesborough*—H. Jones, PM *Stockbridge*—William Butler, printer, *Northampton*—William P. Whiting, PM *Randolph*—Isaiah Thomas, jun. printer, *Worcester*—Henry Brewer, printer, *Springfield*.

Vermont.

Mr. Huntington, printer, *Middlebury*—David Johnson, PM *Newbury*—Z. Lyon, PM and Jacob Smith, Esq. *Royalton*—Geo. Robinson, Esq. *Burlington*—E. W. Reyes, Esq. *St. Albans*—Thomas Foot, PM *Huntsburgh*—James Denison, PM *Shaftsbury*.

Maine.

William Weeks, printer, *Saco*—Mr. Clapp, printer, *Bucktown*.

Rhode-Island.

John Carter, printer, *Providence*.

Connecticut.

Elias Beers, *New-Haven*—John C. Gray, printer, *Danbury*—S. Richards, PM *Farmington*—J. Carrington, PM *Wallingford*.

New-Jersey.

George Sherman, printer, and the PM *Trenton*—Mr. Blauvelt, printer, *New-Brunswick*.

Pennsylvania.

Thomas Welles, Esq. and Charles Miner, printer, *Wilkesbarre*—William Marris, *Philadelphia*—William Prentice, PM *Athens*.

Maryland.

Robert Moore, *Easton*.

Virginia.

Mr. Cowper, printer, *Norfolk*.

South-Carolina.

Joseph Hamilton, printer, *Georgetown*.

Georgia.

Hobby & Bunce, printers, *Augusta*—Seymour & Co. printers, *Savannah*—B. Brewer, *Georgetown*.

Ohio.

Benjamin Ives Gilman, Esq. *Marietta*—H. Canfield, PM *Canfield*—David Hudson, PM *Hudson*.

New Arrangements.

THE editor and proprietor of the Balance, has found, upon an accurate calculation, that the present mode of publishing his paper, does not yield him a suitable compensation for the great trouble and expense of prosecuting the work; and as he can discover no good reason why he should furnish his readers with better paper and twice as much matter as other printers, at the same or a less price, he has resolved on the following arrangements.

After the first of January next, the Balance will be printed in a royal quarto form, on paper at least equal, if not superior to that now used. The two outside leaves, or so much of them as is found necessary, will be devoted to advertisements; and the remainder of the paper to literay, political, and miscellaneous matter *(principally if not wholly original)* in as great variety as at present; and as the advertising pages will not be titled or numbered to correspond with the Balance pages, they may be separated before binding, and the latter only preserved.....The price by mail, will be *two dollars* per annum, the subscribers paying the postage. Considering the terms of other papers, of similar stamp and workmanship, this price will be found comparatively low; and we feel a confidence that every subscriber will be satisfied with the new arrangement.

POSTSCRIPT.

The above plan is proposed on the supposition that the editor will be enabled by the punctuality of his patrons, to continue his work after the present volume; and he hopes that he may not be disappointed: But he declares with truth and sincerity, that unless a considerable portion of his demands are settled within the present and ensuing month, he will deem it his duty to relinquish a laborious and profitless task, for one attended with less risk and perplexity, and promising some advantage.

Terms of the Balance,

FOR 1807.

To City Subscribers, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, payable quarterly.

To those who receive them by Mail, Two Dollars, payable in Advance.

To those who take their papers at the Office, in bundles or otherwise, a deduction from the city price will be made.

A handsome Title Page and Table of Contents will accompany the last number of the Volume.

NOTE.

The first, second, third, fourth and fifth Volumes of the Balance may be had on the following terms:

First Volume...unbound.. -	$ 2,
Second Volume, - - - -	$ 2,50
Third Volume, - - - -	$ 2,50
Fourth Volume, - - - -	$ 2,50
Fifth Volume, - - - -	$ 2,50
The five together, - - -	$ 10

PUBLISHED BY

HARRY CROSWELL,

No. 221, Warren-Street,

HUDSON.

Where printing in general is executed with elegance and accuracy.